

place by the November election, and that is because this administration refused to release most of the Federal dollars promised by the Help America Vote Act until June of 2004, 2 years after it became public law, delaying what could have been a secure election this November.

With 32 million voters in 19 States using punch-card ballots again this November, millions of voters will walk away from the polls not knowing for certain whether their votes were tallied correctly.

The emergence of electronic voting systems, I believe, is a good thing, but not without verifiable technology. Sadly, Republicans have refused to allow for paper-verified voting trails to ensure that each vote is counted correctly. Without a paper trail, there will be no way to conduct a recount should an election be contested.

Why have Congress and the Bush administration failed to produce vital changes since the drawn-out election of 4 short years ago? Some would say it is in the administration's best interests not to change the system.

Mr. Speaker, there is an even greater threat lurking quietly below. That is, the possible disenfranchisement of voters due to inaccurate registration methods and the shady control of voting lists. A recent Caltech/MIT study concluded that 4 million to 6 million votes were lost nationwide in the 2000 election. Half of these were traced to registration problems. In the year 2000, thousands of Floridians were deprived of the right to vote because they shared the same name with someone who had been convicted of a felony. This type of disenfranchisement and the physical intimidation of some voters is no better than the practices used to prevent Southern blacks from voting in the 1950s and 1960s. It appears we have not come very far since then.

We need to be smarter. We need to be smarter in order to secure our elections. I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, the SMART Security Resolution, to address both foreign and domestic threats to our Nation. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART security emphasizes the need for the United States to act as a leader and a model for other less sophisticated, less democratic nations. This means shoring up the credibility of our own election system, including the development of new, verifiable technology, to ensure that our Nation's poor and aged are not disenfranchised. It means avoiding a system where our own citizens are forced to cry out for international observers to ensure the fairness of our elections. SMART security means fully and quickly implementing the reforms stipulated in the Help America Vote Act.

Mr. Speaker, how can this country ever hope to be a true democratic model for the rest of the world when its own elected leaders have failed to ensure that our election system is truly

democratic? Let us be smarter about the way we elect our national leaders, because until we do, our election system will remain one accused of fraud and riddled with doubt, and we will not stand as an example of democracy in the rest of the world.

HONORING OUR FALLEN HEROES WITH A MEMORIAL IN THE CAP- ITOL ROTUNDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today, nine more Americans gave their lives in Iraq, nine more families are going to be without their loved ones this holiday season, and nine more American families are grieving.

Out of those nine, two soldiers and seven marines, perhaps your neighbor, and they are our neighbors, because they are always going to be America's neighbors, holds the distinction of becoming the one thousandth American casualty in Iraq. We salute our soldiers, marines, airmen, sailors, reservists, and guardsmen who are called to duty. We thank them deeply for their service, their valor, and their sacrifice for this country.

The one thousandth casualty in Iraq is a milestone and one we must acknowledge as we continue to reflect on the cost of the war on our Nation's families and the American people. We must honor the service of our troops and pay tribute to their heroism.

For that reason, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), a veteran, and I have written a letter to the Speaker of the House asking him to arrange a temporary memorial in the Capitol Rotunda to our fallen troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, explaining the pictures of each fallen soldier, along with biographic information, which would also provide an opportunity for visitors in the Rotunda of the people's House to write notes in honor of those soldiers to their families, their loved ones, their brothers, their sisters, their mothers and fathers, and husbands and wives.

Throughout its history, the Rotunda has been used for public viewing for fallen heroes, bestowing upon them one of the Nation's highest honors. After World War I, we saluted the fallen soldiers in the Rotunda. After World War II, Korea, Vietnam, we did the same. It is only fitting that we use the Capitol Rotunda of the people's House to honor those who have fallen in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The war in Iraq is not over, and there will certainly be more lives lost, but this tribute is for all Americans to show its respect for the men and women who paid the ultimate sacrifice as well as to their families. In honor of those lost soldiers, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said, "He stands in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die, that freedom might

live and grow and increase its blessings. Freedom lives and through it, he lives in a way that humbles the undertakings of most men."

Just as President Roosevelt honored the fallen of World War II, we believe this tribute would honor our most recent heroes and their families.

Mr. Speaker, since this Congress has begun, we have found time to name, I think at last count, 65 post offices, including 2 tonight. I think we can, and, indeed, it is our duty and our responsibility, to find the time to properly honor those who have sacrificed everything in Iraq and Afghanistan. I hope that we do this as an institution, as a Congress, to use the people's House to pay tribute to those families and allow all those families to know that for everybody who comes here who writes a card, a note, a tribute, that those families who have lost their loved ones will know that they will always be in America's prayers and in America's thoughts.

A colleague, a Republican colleague, outside of his office has that memorial put up. I think it is a great idea. I have asked the Speaker to take that idea and now make it an institution rather than an individual's decision. Regardless of politics, regardless of where you were on the idea of going to war in either Iraq or Afghanistan, we use the people's House, put on that memorial, and let the families know as they get the letters from everybody who visits it, the cards, the letters, the notes, the tributes, they will always be a part of America's family, and they will never be forgotten.

□ 2030

And they will always be in our prayers and our thoughts. I think this is something we owe these families. And I hope we can accomplish this, unlike other matters, in a bipartisan fashion. It is an idea I saw one of our colleagues had done outside his office, and I am hoping now the institution will take it up and make it its own in a proper tribute; and it would be a temporary tribute for all those families and to all those who have fallen in both the theaters of Iraq and Afghanistan.

BREACH OF THE COMMITMENT TO MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when President Bush took office, he assured seniors he would honor the Nation's commitment to Medicare. He said Medicare is the binding commitment of a caring society. He did not say temporary commitment. He did not say faltering commitment. He said binding commitment.

By any standard, raising the Medicare premium by 17.4 percent, that is more than five times the projected increase in Social Security benefits for

seniors, raising the Medicare premium by 17.4 percent is a breach of that commitment, the largest increase in Medicare's 38 year history.

At the Republican convention on Thursday night, the President said, "I believe we have a moral responsibility to honor America's seniors." The next day, late in the afternoon, right before Labor Day, Friday afternoon, the Labor Day weekend, in spite of his comments the night before, the President quietly announced this 17.4 percent increase in premiums for senior citizens to have to pay into Medicare. Right before the Labor Day weekend. Is that what it means to honor seniors?

After President Bush signed the Medicare drug law a year ago, he launched a very expensive taxpayer-financed ad campaign featuring the slogan: "Same Medicare, better benefits." Those ads failed to mention the 17 percent premium increase even though the administration planned it as far back as March 2003. They failed to mention the 10 percent increase in the deductible for doctors' services which was written into the new law. It failed to mention the fact that both the premium and the deductible will continue to increase year after year after year without any corresponding increase in coverage.

Those ads, those taxpayer-financed ads, trying to sell the American people on the new Medicare bill failed to mention that while seniors will be paying more for the same Medicare, HMOs will be, "earning" might not be the right word, but earning more for the same Medicare. \$16 billion more, in fact.

This bill, this Medicare bill, clearly written for the drug industry and for the insurance industry, clearly has put seniors in the back seat. The drug industry, the insurance industries have contributed literally tens of millions of dollars to President Bush's campaign. The insurance industry gets a taxpayer subsidy of \$16 billion. And then seniors see their premiums go up and see their deductibles go up. They have got to find the money somewhere.

Under the Bush plan, in order to pay the insurance companies those subsidies, they need to raise the premiums for seniors more than \$100; they need to raise those premiums, a 17 percent increase. They need to raise those premiums for seniors to make up that money.

These benefits are being lavished on HMOs as a bonus and incentive for HMOs to accelerate their enrollment of Medicare enrollees. Now HMO profits last year without this increased by 50 percent, yet seniors are paying higher premiums so that HMO profits can soar even further. Senior and disabled Medicare enrollees on fixed incomes will pay more. HMOs will earn more and big drug companies will charge more.

The Bush administration in an amazing sleight of hand insisted on prohibiting Medicare from negotiating bulk discounts on behalf of 39 million Medicare beneficiaries on the prescription

drugs the same way that large insurance plans do, the same way that the VA does in our government.

As a result, the drug industry, because of this protection of the drug industry by the Bush administration, the drug industry stands to earn an additional \$160 billion in profits during the next 10 years. \$160 billion in profits in the next 10 years.

Again, more campaign contributions to President Bush from the insurance industry, more tens of millions of dollars in campaign contributions to the Republican leadership and to the President from the drug industry.

It is the same old story, the President says the right thing and then he does the wrong thing. It is the same old story, the President always responding to the best heeled, most organized, wealthiest corporate interests in this city.

Last week, the President again called himself a compassionate conservative, as if eroding senior's fixed incomes is compassionate, as if coercing them into fly-by-night HMOs, as the Medicare bill does, is compassionate, as if relegating seniors to a bargain-basement prescription drug plan is in any way compassionate.

After all, this President has proposed cutting \$60 billion from Medicaid; he had to because the tax cuts that went overwhelmingly to the wealthiest people in our society, he had to find the money someplace when it is the only source of nursing home care for 70 percent of people who need it. It is consistent, but it is not compassionate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order out of order.

HONORING THE MEN FROM WASHINGTON STATE WHO HAVE DIED IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, young men and women are giving up their lives nearly every day to sustain the President's war in Iraq. They are not in Iraq toppling Saddam. That has been done. They are not in Iraq dismantling weapons of mass destruction. There never were any. They are in Iraq dying in George Bush's crusade.

I think it is only fitting that we should give each of the dead a minute of silence here on the floor. But we

cannot because we would have to stand here silent for 16½ hours. That is because today we lost the 1,000th American in Iraq. For what? For what?

The President says we took out Saddam Hussein because he was a bad guy. Well, that could apply to an awful lot of people all over the face of the Earth. They went in there with no plan for establishing the peace. And more people have died since the President made his fabled landing on the Abraham Lincoln saying "mission accomplished" than died before that. More people have died since they handed over control to the Iraqis than died before the mission was accomplished. This has been an unending disaster.

So since we cannot give a minute of silence for every member, let me tell you who has died from my State thus far in Iraq. And I hope every Member will come to the floor and do what I am doing tonight, speak the names of the dead. Think about the futures they have lost and the families they leave behind. And then I hope every American will ask the President why. Why?

From Washington State we have lost Lance Corporal Cedric E. Burns, age 22; Specialist Justin W. Hebert, age 20; Private Duane E. Longstreth, age 19; Private Kerry D. Scott, age 21; Second Lieutenant Benjamin L. Colgan, age 30, distinguished soldier who made his picture on to the front page of Time magazine, very courageous and very good soldier; Specialist Robert T. Benson, age 20; Specialist John R. Sullivan, age 26; Captain James A. Shull, age 32; Specialist Nathan W. Nakis, 19; Sergeant Curt E. Jordan, Jr., age 25; Staff Sergeant Christopher Bunda, age 29; First Lieutenant Michael R. Adams, age 24; Sergeant Jacob R. Herring, age 21; Sergeant Jeffery R. Shaver, age 26; Private Cody S. Calavan, age 19; Lance Corporal Dustin L. Sides, age 22; Staff Sergeant Marvin Best, age 33; Specialist Jeremiah W. Schmunk, age 21; Sergeant Yadir G. Reynoso, age 27; Lance Corporal Kane M. Funke, age 20; Lance Corporal Caleb J. Powers, age 21; Sergeant Jason Cook, age 25.

These men have died in this crusade in a war that was never understood by the people who started it. They had no reason to go to Iraq and they went anyway, and these people from my State paid the price.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)